

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF  
INTERVIEW

Attorney Docket No.: Q77598

U.S. Application No.: 10/671,667

**REMARKS**

**I. Formal Matters**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 9-14 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants editorially amend claims 1, 10, 11 and 14. The amendments to claims 1, 10, 11 and 14 were made for reasons of clarity and precision of language.

Applicants thank the Examiner for initialing the information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on August 2, 2006.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the courteous in-person interview on May 30, 2007. An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was not provided to the Applicants. Nevertheless, Applicants submit a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance is as follows:

During the Interview, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 4, 9, 10 and 14 were discussed.

Specifically, with regard to claim 1, the Examiner requested that claim 1 be amended in order to clarify the structural relationship between the internal housing, the card holding structure and the slope. Several possible amendments were discussed. The Examiner agreed that an amendment clarifying the relationship, such as provided in the claims section above, would overcome the cited art of record. Applicants have amended claim 1 as discussed during the Interview. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

With regard to claims 2, 4 and 9-13, those claims depend from claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF  
INTERVIEW

Attorney Docket No.: Q77598

U.S. Application No.: 10/671,667

dependency on claim 1. They are also allowable because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

For example, claims 4 and 9 were discussed during the interview. With regard to claim 4, the distinction between a card insertion port and a check opening was discussed. As mentioned during the interview, **the card insertion port, and the check opening are two separate openings in the internal housing**. The Examiner agreed that claim 4, in its present form, is distinguishable from the art of record. Similarly, with regard to claim 9, the difference between a check opening and a card insertion port was discussed. The Examiner agreed that claim 9, in its present form, is also distinguishable from the art of record. As such, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejections.

With regard to claim 10, the Examiner requested for Applicants to clarify the structural relationship between the internal housing, the card itself and the protrusion. The Examiner agreed that claim 10, amended as provided in the claims section above, is distinguishable from the art of record.

Claim 14 was also discussed during the Interview. With regard to claim 14, the Examiner requested for the claim to be amended so as to clarify the relationship between elements of the structure, as discussed with respect to claim 1. The Examiner indicated that claim 14, in its amended form, is distinguishable from the art of record. Specifically, the Examiner agreed that the combination of references does not include at least “a stopper part **located in said slope part**, wherein the stopper part is ductile so as to conform to the slope of the slope part when

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF  
INTERVIEW

Attorney Docket No.: Q77598

U.S. Application No.: 10/671,667

pressure is applied.” Applicants have amended claim 14 as requested by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 14 is distinguishable from the art of record.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 11, 2007